

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 14-22, 27-39 and 44-46 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 21 and 46 are independent.

By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 21, 27, 30 and 46 are amended, and claims 7 and 26 are canceled without prejudice. No new matter is involved. Support for the features added to independent claims 1, 21 and 46 is clearly supported by Applicant's originally filed disclosure (for example in Applicant's Figs. 5A - 5F). Support for the substantive amendments to the independent claims is found, for example, in the application as originally filed in Fig. 3 and its associated description in the specification, e.g., paragraphs [0035] and [0036].

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-12, 14-22, 26, 28-38 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,282,655 to Given in view of SANYO Multimedia Projector PLV-70 Owner's Manual (hereinafter "Sanyo").

Claims 8, 27 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Given and Sanyo in view of U.S. Patent 5,153,580 to Pollack.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action and is not being repeated here.

Initially, Applicant respectfully submits that Given, the primary reference used in this rejection, fails to disclose several positively recited features of the claimed invention including, for example, (1) activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time; (2) continuously implementing the activated advance screen saver warning by the display apparatus until system activity by a user of the system is detected; (3) deactivating the advance screen saver warning so that it is no longer displayed when a system input activity is detected, wherein the screen saver is activated

when the current system idle time is greater than or equal to the screen saver standby time; and (4) controlling, during the continuous execution of the advance screen saver warning, the display apparatus to output at least one of a specified sound and a visual warning message window indicative of a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, wherein the visual warning message comprises a textual representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, a numerical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, and a graphical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time.

Given cannot possibly disclose activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time because Given contains no disclosure of determining if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time.

Furthermore, Given teaches a computer system that adds a motion sensor to a computer keyboard in order to sense whether a user is nearby. After a set amount of time, if a user's movement is not detected by the motion sensor the computer system will proceed to shut down mode. However, prior to actually shutting down the computer, the Given prior art reference teaches emitting an audible warning (i.e., "sonic reminder") in case a nearby user does not wish to actually shut down the computer.

Additionally, Sanyo, the secondary reference used in this rejection, fails to disclose the following positively claimed features, i.e., (1) activating an advance screen saver warning before activating a screen saver if the current system idle time is greater than or equal to a time difference between the screen saver standby time and the advance screen saver warning time; and (2) wherein the visual warning message comprises a textual representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, a numerical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, and a graphical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, wherein the visual warning message comprises a

textual representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, a numerical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time, and a graphical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time.

In other words, both references fail to disclose at least two positively recited features of the claimed invention. Thus, logically, there is no basis in either of these two references for the aforementioned three positively recited features of the claimed invention.

Because the Given reference only teaches an audible warning system, the Office Action turns to Sanyo to teach the display of the advance screen saver warning. However, while Sanyo does provide a type of visual warning, it can clearly be seen by the screenshot provided by the Sanyo NPL manual (p. 37) that only a textual representation ("No signal") and a numerical representation ("4 : 50") is taught. In contrast, the independent claims, as amended, recite a combination of three separate and distinct types of visual representations to provide the display of the advance screen saver warning: a textual representation, numerical representation and a graphical representation. Neither Given, Sanyo, nor any combination thereof, teaches displaying the graphical representation of the time difference between the screen saver standby time and the current system idle time as recited in our claims. This new claim feature is fully supported by the original disclosure, and specifically can be seen in Figs. 5A-5F of the current application. Please note examples of the graphical representation include the clock and countdown bar graphic.

Furthermore, the advance screen saver warning recited in the independent claims is displayed prior to a screen saver initiation whereas the advance warning taught by the prior art references, both Given and Sanyo, is given prior to a complete "turn-off" event. In other words, unlike the currently recited claims that provide an advance screen saver warning prior to displaying a screen saver, both the Given and Sanyo references provide a warning prior to a "turn-off" event. For the Given reference, the advance warning is provided prior to the computer being turned off. For the Sanyo reference, the advance warning is provided prior to the projector lamp being turned off.

Because the claimed invention provides an advance screen saver warning prior to a screen saver initiation, and not a "turn-off" event, patentably distinguishes the claimed invention from a

simple "turn-off" event because the screen saver initiation is specifically a mode of operation that is made available as an alternative to the simple "turn-off" event. The screen saver mode is more advantageous than a simple "turn-off" event because it does not require an initial boot-up sequence and processing that is required when turning on a computer/projector after turning such a product off. An initial boot-up sequence can take a relatively long time and be undesirable to a user that wishes quick access to the computer/projector. In contrast, the screen saver is a simple standby mode that can immediately be actuated by any activity by the user, and therefore a user does not need to wait through a relatively long boot-up period when trying to access the main features of a computer/projector from a screen saver mode.

Similarly, neither Givens nor Sanyo discloses the corresponding method steps in independent claim 46.

Accordingly, no matter how Givens and Sanyo are combined, the combination cannot possibly disclose, suggest, or otherwise render obvious the claimed invention.

Additionally, with respect to claims 8, 27 and 39, Applicant notes that the Pollock reference is not applied to remedy the aforementioned shortcomings of the Givens and Sanyo references, and, as a result, the Office Action does not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 8, 27 and 39.

Thus, the Office Action fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the claimed invention.

So, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested,

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert J. Webster, Registration No.

46,472, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: June 17, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Cing #40953
David A. Bilodeau
Registration No.: 42325
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000